

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have any time to yield, unless I am given additional time.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be given additional time so that he may yield to me for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Oregon so that the Senator from Oregon may ask him a question?

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may be given an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Vermont being granted an additional minute?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have 5 or 10 minutes or a half hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a feeling that the Senator from Vermont, as the dean on the Republican side of the aisle, may be able to get some information from my party's administration. If he is able to do so, we will be very grateful to him. I cannot get an answer from the administration. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if he will try to find out what the reason is for moving some offices of the Treasury from Portland, Oreg., out of my State. There is only one-way traffic with regard to Oregon. All the offices are being moved out of the State, whether they concern the Treasury, the regional offices of the Post Office, or the Federal Power Commission. As I say, it is all one-way traffic in Oregon. We cannot understand the reason for this move. If the dean on the Republican side of the aisle can obtain the answer for us, he will be doing a great personal favor for the people of Oregon.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield, if the time is not taken out of my 10 minutes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be given an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HART. First I should like to say that the commitment which had been given to the people of Michigan and to their delegation in Congress has gone completely by the board. After a careful and intensive survey it was determined by the Internal Revenue Service that a data-processing center, one of nine throughout the country, would be located in the Detroit metropolitan area, which embraces a region of many counties.

The reorganization plan proposed yesterday by the Treasury Department has removed that data-processing center.

To us this proposal must be a complete oversight. I say that because I am convinced that the administration would not go back on its commitment, given to us so solidly.

When we heard about it, we went to the White House. I believe that is the euphemistic way of referring to people without describing them further. At the White House we voiced our protest against this proposal.

I trust that the commitment given to us will be honored. If the Treasury Department has any concern about getting a tax bill through Congress, it ought to double check its relationship with Congress. The proposed step is not one which will be found in any basic text on how to get along with people or how to win friends.

Mr. AIKEN. I really appreciate the comments of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield me another 10 seconds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may have an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am particularly proud of myself for having asked the dean of the Republican side to get this information for me from the present administration, particularly the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, who, after all, must assume some responsibility for some of the moves. I should like to work with the Senator from Vermont to see if between us, we can get an answer from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what degree of responsibility is assumed by the Republican Secretary of the Treasury.

Over the years, the Internal Revenue offices of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—and I think I may include Rhode Island, too, since Rhode Island also is affected by this order—have been efficient and respected and have never been touched by the breath of scandal.

Why at this time should all these offices be moved into Boston? The personnel of those offices have served well for 20 years; yet now they are told that they will have to fight for their new jobs, if they can get them. The only assurance they have is that they will not have their pay cut or will not lose their jobs until after the next election—or 2 years from now.

Why should a system which has worked so well over the years now be upset in favor of one which is dubious?

In reply to the question asked by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], this latest act on the part of the Internal Revenue Service merely follows a pattern which, while it originated a long time ago, has been accelerated rapidly during the past 2 years, namely, the pattern of breaking down State lines and concentrating the activities in a few urban centers of wealth, population, industry, and political power.

It is said by the administration that this is being done in only 12 States; and that the other 38 States certainly will not complain. I hope the other 38 States are not deluding themselves in any way; their turn is coming. As soon as the administration has abolished the offices and destroyed the pride of management of good offices in 12 States, it will certainly select 12 more States. The administration has not tried to touch any State south of Delaware yet; but it will. I assure the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and the Senators from the other Southern States that their turn will come. The administration is selecting a few States at a time in order to accomplish its program, but it is following a pattern of concentrating its power in a few great urban centers of the United States, from which operations can be more easily controlled by a few persons in Washington.

I hope I have made it clear that I do not approve of the action taken by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I observe the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] on his feet. If he wishes to defend New York, that is all right. I believe the regional office of the Internal Revenue Service in New England has been well handled and has been under good management. When the Government now seeks to consolidate district offices on a flimsy pretext, it is time for us to look out.

RAY OF RIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our sympathy goes out to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961. They were mature men, not boys seeking adventure. Possibly they were employees of the Central Intelligence Agency who had been given the job of training anti-Castro Cubans in Guatemala for the invasion then being planned. This was during the Eisenhower administration. According to news accounts, their pay was \$1,900 per month. Whether this big pay made them soldiers of fortune, if they volunteered for combat just before the ill-fated invasion, is a matter for argument. Undoubtedly, it was not expected that they would themselves engage in combat. Their job was to teach and train. Presumably in the excitement of the invasion, they offered to go in fighting. They became casualties of the Bay of Pigs invasion. It may be that the checks for \$225 received every other week by each of these four widows come from the CIA. It is said that these payments will continue until the widows remarry. Let us see: \$225 every other week amounts to approximately \$487 per month. Unfortunately there are a number of widows with children now of college age, of officers of our Air Force who lost their lives in combat in the service of their country in World War II. Have those war widows whose husbands, Air Force pilots or bombardiers in World War II who died heroically for their country, received as much as \$487 per month from a grateful Government?